1

4

6 7

10 11

12 13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

252627

28

## HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

REQUESTING THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS TO CALL FOR A
CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION TO PROPOSE A CONSTITUTIONAL
AMENDMENT TO ADDRESS CONCERNS RAISED BY THE UNITED STATES
SUPREME COURT DECISION IN CITIZENS UNITED V. FEDERAL
ELECTION COMMISSION.

WHEREAS, the first president of the United States, George Washington, stated, "[t]he basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their Constitutions of Government"; and

WHEREAS, it was the intention of the framers of the Constitution of the United States, as stated in James Madison's Federalist Papers, that the Congress of the United States should be "dependent on the people alone"; and

WHEREAS, that dependency has evolved from a dependency on the people alone to a dependency on those who spend excessively in elections, through political campaigns or third-party groups; and

WHEREAS, the United States Supreme Court ruling in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, 558 U.S. 310 (2010) removed restrictions on amounts of independent political spending; and

WHEREAS, the removal of those restrictions has resulted in the unjust influence of powerful economic forces, which have supplanted the will of the people by undermining the people's ability to choose their political leadership, write their own laws, and determine the fate of their state; and

WHEREAS, Article V of the United States Constitution requires the United States Congress to call a constitutional

## H.C.R. NO. 53

convention upon application of two-thirds of the legislatures of the several states for the purpose of proposing amendments to the United States Constitution; now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-eighth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 2015, the Senate concurring, that pursuant to Article V of the United States Constitution, the United States Congress is requested to call a convention for the purpose of proposing amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America to address concerns raised by the United States Supreme Court decision in Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission, 558 U.S. 310 (2010) and related cases and events; and

 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this be a continuing application considered together with applications calling for a convention passed in the 2013-2014 Vermont legislature as Resolution No. 454, the 2013-2014 California legislature as Assembly Joint Resolution No. 1, the 2013-2014 Illinois legislature as Senate Joint Resolution No. 42, and all other past, pending, and future applications until at least two-thirds of the several states have applied for a convention and the convention is convened by Congress; and

 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this application is for a limited constitutional convention and does not grant Congress the authority to call a constitutional convention for any purpose other than the sole purpose set forth in this Concurrent Resolution; and

 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the delegates to the constitutional convention comprise individuals currently elected to state and local office or individuals elected as delegates from each congressional district; provided that all individuals elected or appointed to federal office, now or in the past, be prohibited from serving as delegates to the convention, and for the convention to retain the ability to restrict or expand the power of its delegates within the limits expressed above; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that certified copies of this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States
House of Representatives, the Minority Leader of the United
States House of Representatives, the Majority Leader of the
United States Senate, and members of Hawaii's congressional
delegation.

6 7

> OFFERED BY: HCR LRB 15-1106.doc

## H.C.R. NO. 53

Mark Hall Lyn Deleite

Chin Why Jang gan

John Mark FEB 2 6 2015